



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/769,328	01/26/2001	Takahiro Yajima	35.C15069	5126

5514 7590 06/13/2003

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

CROWELL, ANNA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1763

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/769,328

Applicant(s)

YAJIMA ET AL.

Examiner

Michelle Crowell

Art Unit

1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7 and 8 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6 and 9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Roth (U.S. 5,938,854).

Referring to Figure 4 and column 7, lines 16-27, Roth discloses a plasma processing apparatus generating plasma in a discharge space defined between a power-applying electrode 22 and a flexible substrate 21 in a vacuum chamber; the substrate acting as an electrode disposed opposingly to the power-applying electrode (col. 7, lines 21-27, col. 5, lines 37-39); and decomposing a material gas feed into the vacuum chamber (column 5, lines 40-45), wherein; the substrate has a flexibility, and the power-supplying electrode 22 is provided with an undulation on its surface on the side of the discharge space in such a way that the distance between the substrate and the power-applying electrode 22 is a desired value in agreement with a curvature of the substrate 21.

Regarding claim 3, Figures 5a, 5b, 5c and column 7, lines 28-58, Roth discloses a power-applying electrode having a structure comprising a plurality of sheets 22, 24 which are bundled upright with respect to the substrate 21.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Roth (U.S. 5,938,854) in view of Tsubone et al (Japanese Patent Publication 63069234) and Itoh (U.S. 5,879,741).

The teachings of Roth are discussed above.

Roth fails to teach a means for pressing the power-applying electrode.

Referring to Drawing 1 and the abstract, Tsubone et al. teaches that it is known to use an air cylinders (means for pressing) 33 and 38 are used to raise and lower electrode 11. When the air cylinders 33 and 38 expand, the electrode 11 is lifted. When the air cylinders 33 and 38 contract, the electrode 11 is lowered. The air cylinders are used because minimum parts are

Art Unit: 1763

required, thereby reducing cost. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the electrode of Roth with the air cylinders as taught by Tsubone et al. This would allow the electrode to be raised and lowered onto the substrate, hence shaping the electrode to provide a uniform film on the substrate.

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roth (U.S. 5,938,854) in view of Itoh (U.S. 5,879,741).

The teachings of Roth are discussed above.

Roth fails to teach a transportation mechanism..

Referring to Figure 4, column 3, lines 60-65, and column 4, lines 19-25, Itoh teaches a direction 12 (transportation mechanism) which is the transportation path of the filmy flexible substrate 3. Direction 12 is used to continuously feed a substrate 3 to various processing stations. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the chamber of Roth with the transportation mechanism as taught by Itoh. This would allow a substrate to be continuously fed to various processing chambers.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 and 9 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michelle Crowell whose telephone number is (703) 305-1956. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 - 4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Mills can be reached on (703) 308-1633. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/769,328

Page 6

Art Unit: 1763

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

AMC *aml*
June 10, 2003

Luz L. Alejandro
Luz L. Alejandro
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1763